

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 3-7 and 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1-30 were rejected as being anticipated by Wada (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,618).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with regard to Claims 3-7 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The basis of the rejection is that the use of the term “own” is allegedly vague. However, it is respectfully submitted that this term is not vague when the present invention is properly understood. In reference to Claim 3 for example, Claim 3 refers to a node that converts “an own address”, meaning “its own address”, in the destination address of the received packet into an address of a higher-rank station. The use of the term “an own address”, refers to the address for that particular node. It is believed that the use of the term “own” less vague than using the term “its”. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3-7 and 13-17, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, if the Examiner still disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of each of the claims as being anticipated by Wada. It is believed that Wada is directed to a completely different system that employs either the use of broadcast messages (see e.g., “first operation” (column 16, line 17 to column 17, line 10) or the use of migration host messages as explained in operation two at column 17, line 11 to column 18, line 52. The outstanding Office Action asserts the passages at columns 15-16 and column 17 as being relevant to the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As previously discussed, in the first operation of Wada, Wada operates based on the use of using a broadcast message (see, e.g., column 16, lines 57-63) to announce to all devices on the network that a migration of the host unit has occurred. However, this type of broadcasting increases a load on the network, which is previously discussed and distinguished in the background section of the present patent application, (see e.g., page 1, line 21 to page 2, line 4). Moreover, it was the present inventors that recognized with conventional system an increase in communication load on the network occurs when the movement of the host is frequently made. Such would be the case with the use of broadcast messages as discussed in the first operation of Wada.

Furthermore, in the second operation of Wada, as explained at column 17, beginning at line 12, Wada relies on the use of address conversion post information with the marking (column 17, line 61) of communication packets to indicate that a destination address has changed and sends the same to a communication control unit 4. However, this really is just an alternative to the first operation in Wada, where a broadcast message is used. Moreover, by marking that a particular address has changed for a device, the size of the packets increases, as would be the case with an encapsulation technique or a tunneling technique, thus increasing the communication load.

The present invention as claimed in Claim 1 for example avoids this technique by not increasing the communication demands, but rather, by clever use of a repeating node that converts a predetermined address into an address of a higher rank station of a transmission-source address, and at the repeating node, converting a predetermined address of the destination address into an address of a higher rank station of the last repeating node for a destination terminal. Using this technique, does not increase the communication load required to handle migration of the terminal from one network to another, or even within a

network, handled by different base stations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Wada does not anticipate the invention defined by Claim 1.

For substantially the same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-30, although of differing scope and/or perhaps a different statutory class, are also believed to patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-30, is definite and patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present invention is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
BDL:smi

I:\ATTY\BDL\201166US\201166US-RESP.DOC